arXiv:1103.5823v1 [math.PR] 30 Mar 2011

Equivalence of ensembles under inhomogeneous conditioning and its applications to random Young diagrams

Tadahisa Funaki

March 30, 2011

Abstract

We prove the equivalence of ensembles for Bernoulli measures on $\mathbb{Z}$ conditioned on two conserved quantities under the situation that one of them is spatially inhomogeneous. For the proof, we extend the classical local limit theorem for a sum of Bernoulli independent sequences to those multiplied by linearly growing weights. The motivation comes from the study of random Young diagrams. We discuss the relation between our result and the so-called Vershik curve which appears in a scaling limit for height functions of two-dimensional Young diagrams.

1 Introduction

The equivalence of ensembles, that is the asymptotic equivalence of canonical and grand canonical ensembles for large systems, plays a fundamental role in equilibrium statistical physics [13], [6], [9] and also in some problems related to statistics [2], [3]. It is mostly discussed for canonical ensembles obtained under conditioning on spatially homogeneous physical quantities. In our problem, the grand canonical ensembles are simply Bernoulli measures on $\mathbb{Z}$, but the system has two conservation laws so that the corresponding canonical ensembles are defined through conditioning on a quantity which is not translation-invariant. As a result, the macroscopic profile for the grand canonical ensemble turns out to be spatially dependent. We will show that this profile has a connection to the so-called Vershik curve which appears in a scaling limit for two-dimensional Young diagrams, [14], [1], [4].

The height function ψ_q of a two-dimensional Young diagram, which is associated with a distinct partition $q = \{q_1 > q_2 > \cdots > q_K \geq 1\}$ of a positive integer M by positive integers $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^K$ (i.e. $M = \sum_{i=1}^K q_i$), is given by a right continuous non-increasing step function

$$\psi_q(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} 1_{\{u<q_i\}}, \quad u \geq 0.$$

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan.
e-mail: funaki@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp, Fax: +81-3-5465-7011.

Keywords: equivalence of ensembles, local limit theorem, Young diagram, Vershik curve.
Abbreviated title (running head): Equivalence of ensembles and applications to random Young diagrams
2010MSC: primary 60K35, secondary 82B20, 60D05, 60F05.
Supported in part by the JSPS Grants (A) 22244007 and 21654021.

Its height difference $\eta = \{\eta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$, is defined by

$$\eta_k = \psi_q(k-1) - \psi_q(k) \in \{0,1\} \quad \text{or} \quad \eta_k = 1 \Longleftrightarrow k \in \{q_i\}_{i=1}^K.$$

Then, in terms of η, the height K of the Young diagram at $u = 0$ is represented as

$$\psi_q(0) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \eta_k$$

and the area M as

$$\int_0^\infty \psi_q(u)du = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} k\eta_k.$$

The sequence $\eta = \{\eta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ can be interpreted as defining a configuration of particles on $\mathbb{N}$ in the sense that the site k is occupied by a particle if $\eta_k = 1$ and vacant if $\eta_k = 0$ and, from the viewpoint of random Young diagrams, it is natural to restrict the space of configurations η to those satisfying $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \eta_k = K$ and $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} k\eta_k = M$, given two constants K and M. The first condition is equivalent to assign the total number of particles in the system, while the second sum involves a non-translation-invariant linearly growing weight k. The simplest random structure can be introduced to the set of Young diagrams with height K at $u = 0$ and area M by means of a uniform probability measure on the space of configurations η with these two constraints. In fact, such random structure is the subject of our study.

The original motivation of this paper comes from the study of the hydrodynamic limit for an area-preserving random dynamic on two-dimensional Young diagrams with height differences restricted to be 0 or 1. Such dynamic, which is a kind of a surface diffusion model studied in physics [12], is introduced in [5]. As we have seen above, it can be transformed into an equivalent particle system on $\mathbb{N}$ with two conservation laws.

We formulate our problem and main results in Section 2. For the proof, we need to extend the local limit theorem for a sum of independent random variables. If the random variables satisfy certain proper moment conditions (see, e.g., Theorems VII. 4 and VII.12 of [11]), the classical theory applies, but in our case, such conditions do not hold since the random variables have unbounded linearly growing weights. This is discussed in Section 3 relying on the fact that the weights are linear by analyzing the behavior of characteristic functions. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to the proofs of main results. We finally show that the limit curves obtained in [1] and here are identical, although the random structures imposed on the set of Young diagrams are different.

2 Main results

Let us state our problem precisely. We consider a particle system on $\mathbb{Z}$ rather than on $\mathbb{N}$ following the usual setting in statistical physics. Each site is occupied by at most one particle. Therefore the particle configuration on $\mathbb{Z}$ is represented by $\eta = \{\eta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma := \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, where $\eta_k = 1$ means that the site k is occupied by a particle and $\eta_k = 0$ means that k is vacant. For a finite set Λ in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \Sigma$, we define

$$K_\Lambda(\eta) := \sum_{k\in\Lambda} \eta_k, \qquad M_\Lambda(\eta) := \sum_{k\in\Lambda} k\eta_k.$$

For given K, M and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$ be the uniform probability measure on the configuration space $\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M} = \{\eta \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell}; K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = K, M_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = M\}$, where $\Lambda_\ell = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}; |k| \le \ell\}$ and $\Sigma_\Lambda = \{0,1\}^\Lambda$. For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and a finite set Λ in $\mathbb{Z}$, let ν_α^Λ be the Bernoulli measure on Σ_Λ with mean α, that is, $\nu_\alpha^\Lambda(\eta) = (1-\alpha)^{\sharp\{k\in\Lambda;\eta_k=0\}}\alpha^{\sharp\{k\in\Lambda;\eta_k=1\}}$ for each $\eta \in \Sigma_\Lambda$. Then, the measure $\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$ is identical to the conditional measure of $\nu_\alpha^{\Lambda_\ell}$ or ν_α^Λ with $\Lambda_\ell \subset \Lambda$ on $\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$: For $\xi \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}(\xi) &= \nu_\alpha^{\Lambda_\ell}(\xi|\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M})\\ &= \nu_\alpha^\Lambda(\eta_{\Lambda_\ell} = \xi|\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M} \times \Sigma_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_\ell})\\ &= \nu_\alpha^\Lambda(\eta = (\xi, \eta_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_\ell})|\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M} \times \{\eta_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_\ell}\})\end{aligned}$$

independently of the choice of the outer conditions $\eta_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_\ell}$; see also Lemma 4.1 below. We have denoted by η_{Λ_ℓ} and $\eta_{\Lambda\setminus\Lambda_\ell}$ the configurations η restricted on these sets.

We first observe the possible values of $K = K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta)$ and $M = M_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta)$ for $\eta \in \Sigma_\ell$. It is easy to see that $0 \le K \le 2\ell + 1$, while the values of M range as

$$|M| \le \frac{1}{2}\big(K(2\ell+1) - K^2\big)$$

under the condition that $K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = K$. Indeed the extreme values of M given K are attained when all K particles are closely packed at the right or left most edges on Λ_ℓ. Accordingly, we have that

$$0 \le \frac{K}{2\ell+1} \le 1, \qquad \left|\frac{M}{(2\ell+1)^2}\right| \le \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{K}{2\ell+1} - \left(\frac{K}{2\ell+1}\right)^2\right).$$

We fix $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \le j \le p$, sequences $K = K_\ell$, $M = M_\ell$ and $k_j = k_{j,\ell}$ are given and satisfy

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \frac{K}{2\ell+1} = \rho \in (0,1), \tag{2.1}$$

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \frac{M}{(2\ell+1)^2} = m \in (-v/2, v/2), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \frac{k_j}{\ell} = x_j \in (-1,1), \tag{2.3}$$

respectively, with distinct limits $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^p$, where $v = \rho(1-\rho)$. A function f on Σ is called local if it depends only on finitely many coordinates in η. The shift operators τ_i are defined by $\tau_i f(\eta) = f(\tau_i\eta)$ and $(\tau_i\eta)_k = \eta_{k+i}$ for $i, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \Sigma$. We are now at the position to formulate our main theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $f_j = f_j(\eta), 1 \le j \le p$ be local functions on Σ. Then, under the conditions* (2.1)–(2.3), *we have that*

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} E_{\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}}[\prod_{j=1}^p \tau_{k_j} f_j] = \prod_{j=1}^p E_{\nu_{\beta(x_j)}}[f_j],$$

where $\nu_\alpha, \alpha \in (0,1)$ *denotes the Bernoulli measure on* Σ *with mean* α *and*

$$\beta(x) \equiv \beta(x;a,b) = \frac{e^{bx}a}{e^{bx}a + (1-a)}, \quad x \in [-1,1], \tag{2.4}$$

with two parameters $a \in (0,1)$ *and* $b \in \mathbb{R}$ *determined from* ρ *and* m *by the relations:*

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \beta(x)dx = 2\rho, \quad \int_{-1}^{1} x\beta(x)dx = 4m. \tag{2.5}$$

The convergence is uniform in (K,M) *in the region that* $\varepsilon \le K/(2\ell+1) \le 1-\varepsilon$ *and* $M/(2\ell+1)^2 \in (-v/2+\varepsilon, v/2-\varepsilon)$ *for every* $\varepsilon > 0$.

For every ρ and m, one can find a and b uniquely as is shown in Lemma 4.2 below. This theorem asserts that, as $\ell \to \infty$ under the canonical ensemble $\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$, the limit distributions are asymptotically independent for microscopic regions which are macroscopically separated, and the microscopic limit distribution around the macroscopic point $x \in (-1,1)$ is the grand canonical ensemble $\nu_{\beta(x)}$ with macroscopically dependent profile $\beta(x)$. It will be useful to have another expression of β:

$$\beta(x) = \frac{1}{b}\frac{g'(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{1}{b}(\log g(x))', \tag{2.6}$$

where $g(x) = e^{bx}a + (1-a)$. In particular, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-1}^{1} \beta(x)dx =& \frac{1}{b}\log\frac{e^{b}a + (1-a)}{e^{-b}a + (1-a)}, \\ \int_{-1}^{1} x\beta(x)dx =& \frac{1}{b}\log\frac{(e^{b}a + (1-a))(e^{-b}a + (1-a))}{(1-a)^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{b^2}\left\{L_2\left(-\frac{ae^{b}}{1-a}\right) - L_2\left(-\frac{ae^{-b}}{1-a}\right)\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where $L_2(z) := -\int_0^z \frac{1}{t}\log(1-t)dt, z < 1$ is the Euler dilogarithm, see [7], p.642.

Remark 2.1. (1) *Theorem 2.1 gives the equivalence of ensembles under the situation that the system has two conservation laws, especially, one of them is not translation-invariant.*
(2) *The uniformity of the convergence near the boundary values of* $K/(2\ell+1)$ *and* $M/(2\ell+1)^2$ *can not be shown, because the cumulant* λ_3*, which controls the error estimate in the local limit theorem, diverges near the boundary values.*
(3) *The macroscopic mean* $\beta(x)$ *of the limit measure is not translation-invariant, but the distribution of the microscopic configuration near each point* x *is a Bernoulli measure so that it is translation-invariant.*
(4) *As we will see in the proof of Lemma 4.2,* a *is increasing in* ρ *and* b *is increasing in* m*, respectively. In particular, the constant* m *measures the extent of the bias for the particles, that is, a larger* m *implies more particles on the right side.*
(5) *The function* $\beta(x)$ *appears in other context: The asymmetric simple exclusion process on* $\mathbb{Z}$ *with jump rates* p *to the right and* q *to the left satisfying* $0 < p < 1, p+q = 1$*, has* $\nu_{\beta(\cdot;a,b)}$ *with* $b = \log p/q$ *as its invariant measure for every* $a \in (0,1)$*, where* $\nu_{\beta(\cdot)}$ *denotes the product measure on* Σ *such that* $E_{\nu_{\beta(\cdot)}}[\eta_k] = \beta(k), k \in \mathbb{Z}$*, and the function* $\beta(\cdot;a,b)$ *is defined by* (2.4) *for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}$ *(or* $x \in \mathbb{Z}$*), see* [10]*, p.382.*

The macroscopic profile $\beta(x)$ has a connection to the Vershik curve which appears in a scaling limit for random Young diagrams distributed under the restricted uniform (Fermi) statistics. In fact, one can associate the height function $\psi^\ell(u), u \in [-\ell-1, \ell]$ of the Young diagram with the particle configuration $\eta \in \Sigma_\ell$ by

$$\psi^\ell(u) = \sum_{k \in \Lambda_\ell : k > u} \eta_k, \quad u \in [-\ell-1, \ell]. \tag{2.8}$$

Note that ψ^ℓ is a right continuous non-increasing step function and satisfies

$$\psi^\ell(-\ell-1) = K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta), \quad \psi^\ell(\ell) = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

with the area

$$\int_{-\ell-1}^{\ell} \psi^\ell(u)\, du = (\ell+1)K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) + M_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta). \tag{2.10}$$

Under the distribution $\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$, we consider the macroscopically scaled height function defined by

$$\tilde{\psi}^\ell(x) := \frac{1}{\ell}\psi^\ell(\ell x), \quad x \in [-1, 1]. \tag{2.11}$$

Corollary 2.2. *Under the conditions* (2.1) *and* (2.2), $\tilde{\psi}^\ell$ *converges as* $\ell \to \infty$ *to* ψ *in probability in the following sense:*

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}\left(\sup_{x\in[-1,1]} \left|\tilde{\psi}^\ell(x) - \psi(x)\right| > \delta\right) = 0,$$

for every $\delta > 0$. *The limit* ψ *is defined by* $\psi(x) = \int_x^1 \beta(y)dy, x \in [-1, 1]$ *with* $\beta(x)$ *determined in Theorem 2.1.*

From (2.1), (2.2), (2.9) and (2.10), the limit ψ satisfies

$$\psi(-1) = 2\rho, \quad \psi(1) = 0, \quad \int_{-1}^{1} \psi(x)dx = 2\rho + 4m \tag{2.12}$$

and has a slope $\psi'(x) = -\beta(x)$. Note that (2.12) is consistent with (2.5). As we have seen in [4], Theorem 2.2, the Vershik curve $\psi_R(x)$ defined for $x \geq 0$ in the restricted uniform statistics having the area $\int_0^\infty \psi_R(x)dx = 1$ satisfies the ordinary differential equation

$$\psi_R'' + c\psi_R'(1 + \psi_R') = 0, \tag{2.13}$$

where $c = \pi/\sqrt{12}$. Here we consider in a rectangular box, and a simple computation with the help of (2.6) shows that the limit ψ in Corollary 2.2 satisfies the same ordinary differential equation (2.13) with $c = -b$. Further discussions on the Vershik curves will be held in Section 5.

3 Local limit theorem for inhomogeneous Bernoulli sequence with unbounded weight

For the proof of Theorem 2.1, we need to establish the local limit theorem jointly for the sum of inhomogeneous Bernoulli sequence and the sum with unbounded linearly growing weights k having some defects in them. Let a continuous function $\alpha = \alpha(\cdot) : [0,1] \to (0,1)$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_k^n \in (0,1)\}_{k=1}^n$ satisfying the condition

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \max_{1\le k\le n} |\alpha_k^n - \alpha(k/n)| = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

be given. Let $\{X_k\}_{k=1}^n \equiv \{X_k^n\}_{k=1}^n$ be $\{0,1\}$-valued independent random variables with mean $E[X_k] = \alpha_k^n$ for $1 \le k \le n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\alpha_- \le \alpha(x), \alpha_k^n \le \alpha_+, x \in [0,1], 1 \le k \le n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ holds with some $0 < \alpha_- < \alpha_+ < 1$. We assume that a subset Γ_n of $\{1,2,\dots,n\}$ is given for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and the size $|\Gamma_n|$ is uniformly bounded in n: $|\Gamma_n| \le C$ for all n. Under these settings, we consider the sums

$$S_n \equiv S_n(X) := \sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} X_k, \quad T_n \equiv T_n(X) := \sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} kX_k, \tag{3.2}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\Gamma_n^c = \{1,2,\dots,n\} \setminus \Gamma_n$; Γ_n are defects in these sums. Then, it is easy to see that the (joint) central limit theorem holds for (S_n, T_n). Indeed, we define

$$\tilde S_n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n}}\big(S_n - E_n\big), \quad \tilde T_n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_n}}\big(T_n - F_n\big),$$

with

$$E_n = \sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} \alpha_k^n, \quad F_n = \sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} k\alpha_k^n, \quad U_n = \sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} v_k^n, \quad V_n = \sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} k^2 v_k^n,$$

where $v_k^n := \alpha_k^n(1-\alpha_k^n)$. Recalling that $\alpha(\cdot) \in C([0,1])$, the condition (3.1) and $|\Gamma_n| \le C$, the asymptotic behaviors of E_n, F_n, U_n and V_n as $n \to \infty$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_n &= n(\bar\alpha + o(1)), \quad F_n = n^2(\check\alpha + o(1)), \\ U_n &= n(\bar v + o(1)), \quad V_n = n^3(\check v + o(1)), \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $\bar\alpha, \check\alpha, \bar v, \check v$ are positive constants defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar\alpha &= \int_0^1 \alpha(x)dx, \quad \check\alpha = \int_0^1 x\alpha(x)dx, \\ \bar v &= \int_0^1 \alpha(x)(1-\alpha(x))dx, \quad \check v = \int_0^1 x^2\alpha(x)(1-\alpha(x))dx, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Then $(\tilde S_n, \tilde T_n)$ weakly converges to (Y_1, Y_2) as $n \to \infty$, where $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)$ is an $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and $E[Y_1^2] = E[Y_2^2] = 1$, $E[Y_1Y_2] = \lambda$, where

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar v \check v}} \int_0^1 x\alpha(x)(1-\alpha(x))dx.$$

Indeed, the convergence of the corresponding characteristic functions is shown by Lemma 3.2 below. Note that $\lambda \in (0,1)$ by Schwarz's inequality. The joint distribution density function of Y is given by

$$q_0(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\lambda^2}} \exp\left\{ -\frac{y_1^2 - 2\lambda y_1 y_2 + y_2^2}{2(1-\lambda^2)} \right\}, \quad y = (y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{3.4}$$

We now state the corresponding local limit theorem. The set of all possible values of (S_n, T_n) is denoted by

$$\mathcal{P}_n := \{(K, L) \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}_+; P(S_n = K, T_n = L) > 0\},$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *We have that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(K,L)\in\mathcal{P}_n} \left| \sqrt{U_n V_n}\, P(S_n = K, T_n = L) - q_0(y_1, y_2) \right| = 0,$$

where

$$y_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n}}(K - E_n), \quad y_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_n}}(L - F_n). \tag{3.5}$$

Remark 3.1. *If $\alpha(\cdot) \in C^1([0,1])$ and α_k^n are given by $\alpha_k^n = \alpha(k/n)$, then the convergence in Proposition 3.1 takes place with speed $O(1/\sqrt{n})$:*

$$\sup_{(K,L)\in\mathcal{P}_n} \left| \sqrt{U_n V_n}\, P(S_n = K, T_n = L) - q_0(y_1, y_2) \right| \le \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}},$$

with some $C > 0$. However, in Section 4, we are forced to consider more general α_k^n satisfying the condition (3.1)*. See Remark 4.1 below.*

The local limit theorem for T_n was studied by [8] in homogeneous Bernoulli case without defects and we extend it to the joint variables (S_n, T_n) in inhomogeneous case with defects. The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 3.1. We essentially follow the arguments in [11], but because of the unboundedness of the weights k for T_n, a phenomenon different from the classical situation arises in the Fourier mode especially for the term I_2 introduced below.

Let $f(s,t;S_n,T_n)$, $s,t \in \mathbb{R}$, be the characteristic function of $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued random variable (S_n, T_n):

$$f(s,t;S_n,T_n) = E\left[e^{i(sS_n + tT_n)}\right],$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$. Then, for all $(K, L) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(2\pi)^2 P(S_n = K, T_n = L) &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{-i(sK+tL)} f(s,t;S_n,T_n)\, dsdt \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n V_n}} \int_{-\sqrt{U_n}\pi}^{\sqrt{U_n}\pi}\int_{-\sqrt{V_n}\pi}^{\sqrt{V_n}\pi} e^{-i(sy_1+ty_2)} f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n)\, dsdt,\end{aligned}$$

where y_1, y_2 are defined by (3.5). The second equality is due to a change of variables noting that

$$f(s,t;S_n,T_n) = \exp\{i(sE_n + tF_n)\} f(\sqrt{U_n}s, \sqrt{V_n}t; \tilde{S}_n, \tilde{T}_n). \tag{3.6}$$

Thus, if we define the error term by

$$R_n(K,L) = (2\pi)^2\{\sqrt{U_nV_n}\,P(S_n = K, T_n = L) - q_0(y_1,y_2)\},$$

it can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(K,L) = &\int_{-\sqrt{U_n}\pi}^{\sqrt{U_n}\pi}\int_{-\sqrt{V_n}\pi}^{\sqrt{V_n}\pi} e^{-i(sy_1+ty_2)} f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n)\,dsdt \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-i(sy_1+ty_2)} e^{-(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)/2}\,dsdt, \end{aligned}$$

since $(2\pi)^2 q_0(y_1,y_2)$ is given by the second integral in the above expression. We divide $R_n(K,L)$ into the sum of three integrals:

$$R_n(K,L) = I_1 + I_2 + I_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{D_{1,n}} e^{-i(sy_1+ty_2)} \left\{ f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n) - e^{-(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)/2} \right\} dsdt, \\ I_2 &= \int_{D_{2,n}} e^{-i(sy_1+ty_2)} f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n)\,dsdt, \\ I_3 &= \int_{D_{3,n}} e^{-i(sy_1+ty_2)} e^{-(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)/2}\,dsdt, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Three domains are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{1,n} &= \{(s,t)\in\mathbb{R}^2; |s|,|t| \le c\sqrt{n}\}, \\ D_{2,n} &= \{(s,t)\in\mathbb{R}^2; c\sqrt{n} < |s| \le \sqrt{U_n}\pi \ \text{ or } \ c\sqrt{n} < |t| \le \sqrt{V_n}\pi\}, \\ D_{3,n} &= \{(s,t)\in\mathbb{R}^2; |s| \ge c\sqrt{n} \ \text{ or } \ |t| \ge c\sqrt{n}\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, with a small enough $c \in (0, \sqrt{v}\pi)$ chosen later.

The estimate on $I_3 \equiv I_{3,n}(K,L)$ is easy. In fact, noting that $s^2 + 2\lambda st + t^2 \ge (1-\lambda)(s^2+t^2)$ and $\lambda < 1$, we have a uniform bound on I_3: There exist $C_1, c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{K,L} |I_3| \le C_1 e^{-c_1 n}. \tag{3.7}$$

To give the estimate on I_1, we prepare a lemma which is a two-dimensional version of Lemma 1 in Chapter V of [11], p.109.

Lemma 3.2. *For every $\delta > 0$, there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that, if $n \ge n_0$,*

$$\left| f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n) - e^{-(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)/2} \right| \le \delta(|s|^3 + |t|^3 + s^2 + t^2) e^{-c_2(s^2+t^2)}$$

holds for every $(s,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $|s|,|t| \le c_3\sqrt{n}$.

Proof. A simple computation leads to

$$f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n)=\prod_{k\in\Gamma_n^c}\left\{\alpha_k e^{i\gamma_k(1-\alpha_k)}+(1-\alpha_k)e^{-i\gamma_k\alpha_k}\right\}, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\gamma_k\equiv\gamma_k^n(s,t):=s/\sqrt{U_n}+tk/\sqrt{V_n}$ and we simply write α_k instead of α_k^n. If $|s|,|t|\le c_3\sqrt{n}$ with $c_3>0$ chosen later, from (3.3), γ_k can be estimated as

$$|\gamma_k|\le\bar{c}c_3, \tag{3.9}$$

with some $\bar{c}>0$. Therefore, since Taylor's formula implies

$$\left|e^z-\left(1+z+\frac{1}{2}z^2\right)\right|\le C_4|z|^3,$$

with some $C_4>0$ for all $z\in\mathbb{C}:|z|\le\bar{c}c_3$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_k e^{i\gamma_k(1-\alpha_k)}&+(1-\alpha_k)e^{-i\gamma_k\alpha_k}\\&=\alpha_k\big(1+i\gamma_k(1-\alpha_k)-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_k^2(1-\alpha_k)^2\big)+(1-\alpha_k)\big(1-i\gamma_k\alpha_k-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_k^2\alpha_k^2\big)+R_k\\&=1-\frac{v_k}{2}\gamma_k^2+R_k,\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

with an error term $R_k\in\mathbb{C}$ having an estimate:

$$|R_k|\le C_4\big(\alpha_k(1-\alpha_k)^3|\gamma_k|^3+(1-\alpha_k)\alpha_k^3|\gamma_k|^3\big)\le C_5|\gamma_k|^3, \tag{3.11}$$

where we write v_k for v_k^n. Let $\log(1+z)$ be the principal value defined for $z\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\{z=x\in\mathbb{R};x\le-1\}$. Then,

$$|\log(1+z)-z|\le C_6|z|^2$$

holds for $|z|<1/2$ with some $C_6>0$, and therefore, from (3.8) and (3.10), we have that

$$\left|\log f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n)-\sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c}\big(-\frac{v_k}{2}\gamma_k^2+R_k\big)\right|\le C_6\sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c}\left|-\frac{v_k}{2}\gamma_k^2+R_k\right|^2, \tag{3.12}$$

if $|-v_k\gamma_k^2/2+R_k|<1/2$ for all $1\le k\le n$. Note that, from (3.9) and (3.11), the last condition holds if we choose $c_3>0$ sufficiently small. However, we see that

$$\sum_{k\in\Gamma_n^c}v_k\gamma_k^2=(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)(1+o(1)), \tag{3.13}$$

by using (3.3) and recalling $|\Gamma_n|\le C$. We thus obtain that

$$\log f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n)=-\frac{1}{2}(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)+R, \tag{3.14}$$

with an error term R having a bound:

$$|R|\le\sum_{k=1}^n|R_k|+2C_6\left(\frac{1}{4}\sum_{k=1}^n v_k^2|\gamma_k|^4+\sum_{k=1}^n|R_k|^2\right)+o(1)(s^2+t^2).$$

The sum over Γ_n^c is bounded by that over all $1 \le k \le n$. However, from (3.11) and (3.3), we have that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} |R_k| \le C_5 \sum_{k=1}^{n} |\gamma_k|^3 \le \frac{C_7}{\sqrt{n}}(|s|^3 + |t|^3), \tag{3.15}$$

with some $C_7 > 0$. For the sum of $v_k^2|\gamma_k|^4$, since $v_k^2 \le (1/4)^2$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{n} v_k^2|\gamma_k|^4 &\le C_8 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\frac{|s|^4}{U_n^2} + \frac{|t|^4 k^4}{V_n^2} \right) \\ &\le \frac{C_9}{n}(|s|^4 + |t|^4) \le \frac{C_9 c_3}{\sqrt{n}}(|s|^3 + |t|^3), \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

with some $C_8, C_9 > 0$, if $|s|, |t| \le c_3\sqrt{n}$. Since (3.9) and (3.11) show that $|R_k|$ is bounded, (3.15) implies that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} |R_k|^2 \le \frac{C_{10}}{\sqrt{n}}(|s|^3 + |t|^3). \tag{3.17}$$

Therefore, (3.15)–(3.17) can be summarized into

$$|R| \le \frac{C_{11}}{\sqrt{n}}(|s|^3 + |t|^3) + o(1)(s^2 + t^2),$$

if $|s|, |t| \le c_3\sqrt{n}$. Coming back to (3.14), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| f(s,t;\tilde{S}_n,\tilde{T}_n) - e^{-(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)/2} \right| &= e^{-(s^2+2\lambda st+t^2)/2}|e^R - 1| \\ &\le e^{-(1-\lambda)(s^2+t^2)/2}|R||e^{|R|}. \end{aligned}$$

However, if $|s|, |t| \le c_3\sqrt{n}$, $|R| \le (C_{11}c_3 + o(1))(s^2 + t^2)$ and therefore, by choosing $c_3 > 0$ sufficiently small and n_0 sufficiently large, we have that

$$e^{-(1-\lambda)(s^2+t^2)/2}e^{|R|} \le C_{12}e^{-c_2(s^2+t^2)},$$

with some $c_2, C_{12} > 0$ for every $n \ge n_0$. We have thus completed the proof of the lemma by changing the choice of n_0 to bound $|R|$ by means of the given $\delta > 0$, if necessary. □

Lemma 3.2 gives a uniform estimate on $I_1 \equiv I_{1,n}(K,L)$ under the choice of $c = c_3$: For every $\delta > 0$,

$$\sup_{K,L} |I_1| \le \delta \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|s|^3 + |t|^3 + s^2 + t^2)e^{-c_2(s^2+t^2)}\, dsdt, \tag{3.18}$$

holds if $n \ge n_0$; note that the last integral is converging.

Finally, we give an estimate on $I_2 \equiv I_{2,n}(K,L)$. Using the relation (3.6), I_2 can be rewritten and estimated as

$$|I_2| \le \sqrt{U_n V_n} \int_{E_{2,n}} |f(s,t;S_n,T_n)|\, dsdt, \tag{3.19}$$

where $E_{2,n} = \{(s,t); c_4 \le |s| \le \pi \ \text{ or } \ c_5/n \le |t| \le \pi\}$ and $c_4 = c \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sqrt{n/U_n}$, $c_5 = c \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sqrt{n^3/V_n} > 0$. Once we can show that there exist sufficiently small $\theta > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\sharp\{k; 1 \le k \le n, k \notin \Gamma_n, s+kt \notin [-\theta,\theta] \mod 2\pi\} \ge \kappa n - 1 - |\Gamma_n|, \tag{3.20}$$

for all $(s,t) \in E_{2,n}$, then we have that

$$|f(s,t;S_n,T_n)| = \left| \prod_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} \{\alpha_k e^{i(s+kt)} + (1-\alpha_k)\} \right| \le r^{\kappa n - 1 - C},$$

where $\alpha_k = \alpha_k^n$ and

$$r := \max_{u:\theta\le|u|\le\pi} \max_{k\in\Gamma_n^c} |\alpha_k e^{iu} + (1-\alpha_k)| < 1,$$

by recalling $0 < \alpha_- \le \alpha_k \le \alpha_+ < 1$. This together with (3.19) and (3.3) proves

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{K,L} |I_2| &\le (2\pi)^2 \sqrt{U_n V_n} r^{\kappa n-1-C} \\ &\le C' n^2 r^{\kappa n - 1 - C}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Three uniform estimates (3.7), (3.18) and (3.21) conclude the proof of Proposition 3.1.

The final task is to show (3.20) for all $(s,t) \in E_{2,n}$. To this end, we may assume $t \ge 0$ by symmetry. We may also assume $\Gamma_n = \emptyset$ and prove (3.20) without $-|\Gamma_n|$ in the right hand side. We rewrite the region $E_{2,n} \cap \{t \ge 0\}$ into a union of three regions: $E_{2,n} \cap \{t \ge 0\} = E_{2,n}^{(1)} \cup E_{2,n}^{(2)} \cup E_{2,n}^{(3)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} E_{2,n}^{(1)} &= \{(s,t); 2\theta \le t \le \pi, |s| \le \pi\}, \\ E_{2,n}^{(2)} &= \{(s,t); \frac{c_5}{n} \le t < 2\theta, |s| \le \pi\}, \\ E_{2,n}^{(3)} &= \{(s,t); 0 \le t < \frac{c_5}{n}, c_4 \le |s| \le \pi\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $c (= c_3)$ and therefore c_5 was chosen sufficiently small so that we may assume $0 < c_5 < 2\pi$. For $(s,t) \in E_{2,n}^{(1)}$, since "$s+kt \in [-\theta,\theta] \bmod 2\pi$" implies "$s+(k+1)t \notin [-\theta,\theta] \bmod 2\pi$", it is obvious that (3.20) holds for $\Gamma_n = \emptyset$ and $\kappa = 1/2$. Now we take $(s,t) \in E_{2,n}^{(2)}$. The n points $\{kt\}_{n=1}^n$ are arranged on $\mathbb{R}$ in an equal distance and the interval $[t, nt]$ containing all these points are covered by at most $m := [(n-1)t/(2\pi)] + 1$ disjoint intervals of length 2π, where $[\ \ ]$ means the integer part. However, for an arbitrary interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ of length 2π,

$$\sharp\{k; 1 \le k \le n, kt \in I, s+kt \in [-\theta,\theta] \mod 2\pi\} \le \frac{2\theta}{t} + 1.$$

Thus, since $c_5/n \le t < 2\theta$ for $(s,t) \in E_{2,n}^{(2)}$, we have that

$$\sharp\{k; 1 \le k \le n, s+kt \in [-\theta,\theta] \mod 2\pi\} \le m\left(\frac{2\theta}{t}+1\right) \le \left(\frac{nt}{2\pi}+1\right)\left(\frac{2\theta}{t}+1\right)$$

$$= \frac{\theta}{\pi}n + \frac{t}{2\pi}n + \frac{2\theta}{t} + 1 \le \frac{2\theta}{\pi}n + \frac{2\theta}{c_5}n + 1 \le \frac{n}{2} + 1,$$

by choosing $\theta : 0 < \theta < (1/\pi + 1/c_5)^{-1}/4$, and this proves (3.20) for $\Gamma_n = \emptyset$ and $\kappa = 1/2$. Finally we take $(s,t) \in E^{(3)}_{2,n}$. Then, since $0 < c_5 < 2\pi$ and $0 \le t \le c_5/n$, n points $\{kt\}_{k=1}^n$ are all located in the interval $[0, 2\pi)$. Now choose $\theta : 0 < \theta < c_4/8$. Then, recalling that $c_4 \le |s| \le \pi$, for example in the case that $-\pi \le s \le -c_4$,

$$\begin{aligned}\{k; 1 \le k \le n, s + kt \in [-\theta, \theta] \mod 2\pi\} &= \{k; 1 \le k \le n, s + kt \in [-\theta, \theta]\} \\ \subset \{k; 1 \le k \le n, kt \ge -\theta - s\} &\subset \{k; 1 \le k \le n, k \ge \frac{7c_4}{8c_5}n\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain (3.20) for $\Gamma_n = \emptyset$ by choosing $\kappa = (7c_4/(8c_5)) \wedge 1 > 0$. The case that $c_4 \le s \le \pi$ can be discussed in a similar way. The proof of (3.20) is completed for all $(s,t) \in E_{2,n}$.

Remark 3.2. *Our argument relies on the specific form k of the weights. It can be extended to linearly growing weights, but not for general weights such as a power of k.*

4 Proof of Theorem 2.1

For a function $\beta = \beta(\cdot) : [-1, 1] \to (0, 1)$, we denote by $\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta(\cdot)}$ the distribution on Σ_{Λ_ℓ} of $\{0, 1\}$-valued independent sequences $\{\eta_k\}_{k\in\Lambda_\ell}$ such that $E[\eta_k] = \beta(k/\ell), k \in \Lambda_\ell$. The next lemma explains the reason that the functions of the form (2.4) appear in the limit.

Lemma 4.1. *For a function $\beta(\cdot) \equiv \beta(\cdot; a, b)$ of the form (2.4), the conditional measure of $\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta(\cdot)}$ on $\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$ is a uniform probability measure for every $a \in (0, 1)$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta(\cdot)}(\cdot|\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}) = \nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}(\cdot).$$

Proof. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let μ_α be the probability measure on $\{0, 1\}$ defined by $\mu_\alpha(1) = \alpha$. Then, if $\alpha = e^b a/(e^b a + (1 - a))$ for some $a \in (0, 1)$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$, it holds that

$$\mu_\alpha(\xi) = z^{-1}_{a,b} e^{b\xi} \mu_a(\xi),$$

for $\xi = 0, 1$ with a constant $z_{a,b} = e^b a + (1 - a)$. Therefore, for $\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta(\cdot)}$ on Σ_{Λ_ℓ} with $\beta(\cdot)$ of the form (2.4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta(\cdot)}(\eta) &= \prod_{k\in\Lambda_\ell} \mu_{\beta(k/\ell)}(\eta_k) = \prod_{k\in\Lambda_\ell} z^{-1}_{a,bk/\ell} e^{bk\eta_k/\ell} \mu_a(\eta_k) \\ &= Z^{-1} e^{b\sum_{k\in\Lambda_\ell} k\eta_k/\ell} \nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_a(\eta),\end{aligned}$$

for $\eta \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell}$ with a normalizing constant $Z \equiv \prod_{k\in\Lambda_\ell} z_{a,bk/\ell} = E_{\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_a}[e^{b\sum_{k\in\Lambda_\ell} k\eta_k/\ell}]$. This implies that

$$\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta(\cdot)}(\cdot|\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}) = \nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_a(\cdot|\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}),$$

since $\sum_{k\in\Lambda_\ell} k\eta_k = M$ on $\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$. However, $\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_a(\cdot|K_{\Lambda_\ell} = K)$ is a uniform measure on $\{\eta \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell}; K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = K\}$ so that $\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_a(\cdot|\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M})$ is also a uniform measure on $\Sigma_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$, that is, $\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}$. □

We next establish the one-to-one correspondence between (ρ, m) and (a, b) defined by (2.5). In particular, one can uniquely find (a, b) for every (ρ, m) in Theorem 2.1. Consider the map Φ for $(a, b) \in (0,1) \times \mathbb{R}$ to $(\rho, m) = (F(a,b), G(a,b)) \in D := \{(\rho, m); \rho \in (0,1), m \in (-v/2, v/2)\}$ with $v = \rho(1-\rho)$ defined by

$$F(a,b) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{1} \beta(x;a,b)dx, \quad G(a,b) = \frac{1}{4}\int_{-1}^{1} x\beta(x;a,b)dx.$$

Lemma 4.2. *The map Φ is a diffeomorphism from $(0,1) \times \mathbb{R}$ onto the domain D.*

Proof. Recalling that $\beta(x;a,b)$ is given by $\beta(x;a,b) = e^{bx}a/g(x;a,b)$ with $g(x) \equiv g(x;a,b) = e^{bx}a + (1-a)$, we can easily compute the derivatives of F and G:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial a} &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{e^{bx}}{g(x)^2}dx, & \frac{\partial F}{\partial b} &= \frac{a(1-a)}{2}\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{xe^{bx}}{g(x)^2}dx, \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial a} &= \frac{1}{4}\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{xe^{bx}}{g(x)^2}dx, & \frac{\partial G}{\partial b} &= \frac{a(1-a)}{4}\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{x^2e^{bx}}{g(x)^2}dx. \end{aligned}$$

This, with the help of Schwarz's inequality, implies that the Jacobian of the map Φ is positive everywhere, that is, $J = \frac{\partial F}{\partial a}\frac{\partial G}{\partial b} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial b}\frac{\partial G}{\partial a} > 0$. In particular, the map Φ is a local diffeomorphism.

For every $b \in \mathbb{R}$, set $C_b := \{(F(a,b), G(a,b)) \in D; a \in (0,1)\}$. Then, C_b is a Jordan arc in D connecting two points $(0,0)$ and $(1,0)$. Indeed, from $\partial F/\partial a > 0$, C_b has no double points so that it is a Jordan arc. As $a \downarrow 0$, we have $\beta(x;a,b) \to 0$ so that $(F(a,b), G(a,b)) \to (0,0)$, while $(F(a,b), G(a,b)) \to (1,0)$ as $a \uparrow 1$, since $\beta(x;a,b) \to 1$. Especially, $C_0 = \{(a,0); a \in (0,1)\}$ is a line segment connecting $(0,0)$ and $(1,0)$. From the fact that $J > 0, \partial F/\partial a > 0$ and $\partial G/\partial b > 0$, we see that the arc C_{b_1} is located above C_{b_2} in the ρ-m plane if $b_1 > b_2$. This proves that the map Φ is one to one.

To show the onto property of Φ, we consider (a, b) satisfying $F(a,b) = \rho$ for a fixed $\rho \in (0,1)$. From (2.7), this condition can be rewritten as

$$a = \frac{e^{2b\rho} - 1}{e^b + e^{2b\rho} - e^{b(2\rho-1)} - 1}$$

and therefore

$$\beta(x;a,b) = \frac{e^{bx}(e^{2b\rho} - 1)}{e^{bx}(e^{2b\rho} - 1) + (e^b - e^{b(2\rho-1)})},$$

which behaves as

$$\beta(x;a,b) \to \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad x + 2\rho > 1, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad x + 2\rho < 1, \end{cases}$$

as $b \to \infty$. Thus we have

$$\lim_{b\to\infty} G(a,b) = \frac{1}{4}\int_{1-2\rho}^{1} xdx = \frac{1}{2}\rho(1-\rho),$$

under the condition $F(a,b) = \rho$. In a similar way, we can show that

$$\lim_{b\to-\infty} G(a,b) = -\frac{1}{2}\rho(1-\rho).$$

This proves the onto property of the map Φ. □

We are now at the position to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. Our method is standard in the sense that we apply the local limit theorem to compute the conditional distributions, see, e.g., [9], p.353. The novelty lies in the following point. When applying Proposition 3.1, the term $q_0(y_1, y_2)$ needs to be uniformly positive to dominate the error term and this restricts our choice of the underlying measures in such a way that both y_1 and y_2 are sufficiently close to 0. For instance, in [9], it was only required to adjust the density parameter so that the macroscopic profile was constant over the space, but here the problem involves two parameters K and M or ρ and m. However, once we take the inhomogeneous Bernoulli measures with the functions $\beta(\cdot; a, b)$ as macroscopic profiles, our choice allows two parameters a and b. This suits our purpose and we can realize the situation that both y_1 and y_2 are close to 0 at the same time under a suitable choice. The local limit theorem with defects is prepared to treat the numerator B_ℓ introduced later.

We denote the supports of the local functions f_j in Theorem 2.1 by $\Gamma_j \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and set $\Gamma(= \Gamma^{(\ell)}) = \cup_{j=1}^p \tau_{k_j}\Gamma_j$, where $\tau_{k_j}\Gamma_j = \Gamma_j + k_j$ and recall $k_j = k_{j,\ell}$. Note that $\Gamma \subset \Lambda_\ell$ and $\{\tau_{k_j}\Gamma_j\}_{j=1}^p$ are disjoint if ℓ is sufficiently large, since k_j asymptotically behave as $x_j\ell$ and $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^p \subset (-1, 1)$ are distinct. Then, for every function $\beta_\ell(\cdot)$ of the form (2.4), Lemma 4.1 shows that

$$E_{\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}}[\prod_{j=1}^p \tau_{k_j} f_j] - \prod_{j=1}^p E_{\nu_{\beta(x_j)}}[f_j] \tag{4.1}$$

$$= \sum_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^\Gamma} \big(\prod_{j=1}^p f_j(\xi_j) - \prod_{j=1}^p E_{\nu_{\beta(x_j)}}[f_j]\big) \frac{\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta_\ell(\cdot)}\big(\eta|_\Gamma = \xi, K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = K, M_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = M\big)}{\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta_\ell(\cdot)}\big(K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = K, M_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) = M\big)},$$

where $\beta(\cdot)$ is the function determined in Theorem 2.1, $\eta|_\Gamma$ stands for the restriction of η to Γ and we denote by $\xi_j = \xi|_{\Gamma_j}$. For given $K = K_\ell$ and $M = M_\ell$, our special choice of $\beta_\ell(\cdot)$ will be the function $\beta_\ell(\cdot) = \beta(\cdot; a_\ell, b_\ell)$ of the form (2.4) with the solution (a_ℓ, b_ℓ) of two equations (2.5) for $\rho = K/(2\ell + 1)$ and $m = M/(2\ell + 1)^2$.

To apply Proposition 3.1 for $\{\eta_k\}_{k\in\Lambda_\ell}$, we need to shift it and consider $X = \{X_k\}_{k=1}^n$ with $n = 2\ell + 1$ determined by $X_k = \eta_{k-\ell-1}(\equiv (\tau^{-1}_{\ell+1}\eta)_k)$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. For such X and defects $\Gamma_n \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we denote two sums S_n and T_n in (3.2) by $S_n^{\Gamma_n}(X)$ and $T_n^{\Gamma_n}(X)$, respectively, to indicate the defects clearly. Then, we have that

$$S_n^\emptyset(X) = K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad T_n^\emptyset(X) = M_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta) + (\ell + 1)K_{\Lambda_\ell}(\eta). \tag{4.2}$$

The numerator of the fractional expression in the right hand side of (4.1) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{\alpha^n}\big(X|_{\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma} = \tau^{-1}_{\ell+1}\xi, S_n^\emptyset(X) = K, T_n^\emptyset(X) = M + (\ell + 1)K\big) \\ &\quad = \nu^\Gamma_{\beta_\ell(\cdot)}(\xi) P_{\alpha^n}\Big(S_n^{\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma}(X) = K - S_n^{(\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma)^c}(\tau^{-1}_{\ell+1}\xi), \\ &\qquad\qquad T_n^{\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma}(X) = M + (\ell + 1)K - T_n^{(\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma)^c}(\tau^{-1}_{\ell+1}\xi)\Big), \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha^n = \{\alpha^n_k\}_{k=1}^n := \{\beta_\ell((k - \ell - 1)/\ell)\}_{k=1}^n$. We have denoted by P_{α^n} the distribution of X such that $E[X_k] = \alpha^n_k$ for $1 \le k \le n$, by $\nu^\Gamma_{\beta_\ell(\cdot)}$ the measure $\nu^{\Lambda_\ell}_{\beta_\ell(\cdot)}$ restricted on Γ, and $(\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma)^c = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma$. However, under the scaling conditions (2.1) and (2.2), by Lemma 4.2, $\beta_\ell(\cdot)$ converges to $\beta(\cdot)$ uniformly:

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \max_{x\in[-1,1]} |\beta_\ell(x) - \beta(x)| = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Hence, we have that

$$\sum_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^\Gamma} (\prod_{j=1}^p f_j(\xi_j) - \prod_{j=1}^p E_{\nu_{\beta(x_j)}}[f_j])\nu^\Gamma_{\beta_\ell(\cdot)}(\xi) = o(1),$$

as $\ell \to \infty$. Therefore, (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$= \sum_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^\Gamma} (\prod_{j=1}^p f_j(\xi_j) - \prod_{j=1}^p E_{\nu_{\beta(x_j)}}[f_j])\nu^\Gamma_{\beta_\ell(\cdot)}(\xi) \times \left\{ \frac{B_\ell}{A_\ell} - 1 \right\} + o(1), \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_\ell &:= P_{\alpha^n}\left(S_n^{\emptyset}(X) = K, T_n^{\emptyset}(X) = M + (\ell+1)K \right), \\ B_\ell &:= P_{\alpha^n}\Bigg(S_n^{\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma}(X) = K - S_n^{(\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma)^c}(\tau_{\ell+1}^{-1}\xi), \\ &\qquad\qquad T_n^{\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma}(X) = M + (\ell+1)K - T_n^{(\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma)^c}(\tau_{\ell+1}^{-1}\xi) \Bigg). \end{aligned}$$

We now apply Proposition 3.1 to compute the asymptotic behaviors of A_ℓ and B_ℓ. Note that, from (4.3), $\alpha^n = \{\alpha^n_k\}_{k=1}^n$ satisfies the condition (3.1) with $\alpha(x) := \beta(2x-1), x \in [0,1]$. By the choice of (a_ℓ, b_ℓ), we can show that $y_1 = y_2 = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ as $\ell \to \infty$ (or equivalently $n \to \infty$) for y_1 and y_2 defined by (3.5) for both A_ℓ and B_ℓ. Indeed, for A_ℓ,

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n}}(K - E_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n}} \left\{ K - \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_\ell\left(\frac{k-\ell-1}{\ell}\right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n}} \left[K - \ell \left\{ \int_{-1}^1 \beta_\ell(x)dx + O\left(\frac{1}{\ell}\right) \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n}} \left[K - \ell \left\{ \frac{2K}{2\ell+1} + O\left(\frac{1}{\ell}\right) \right\} \right] = O(1/\sqrt{n}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, for the third equality, we have used the uniform bound: $\sup_\ell \max_{x\in[-1,1]} |\beta'_\ell(x)| < \infty$, recall the choice of $\beta_\ell(\cdot)$ for the fourth and (3.3) for the last. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} y_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_n}}(L - F_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_n}} \left\{ M + (\ell+1)K - \sum_{k=1}^n k\beta_\ell\left(\frac{k-\ell-1}{\ell}\right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_n}} \left[M + (\ell+1)K - \ell^2 \left\{ \int_{-1}^1 (x+1)\beta_\ell(x)dx + O\left(\frac{1}{\ell}\right) \right\} \right] \\ &= O(1/\sqrt{n}). \end{aligned}$$

For B_ℓ, compared with A_ℓ, there are additional terms

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{U_n}} \left\{ S_n^{(\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma)^c}(\tau_{\ell+1}^{-1}\xi) - \sum_{k\in\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma} \beta_\ell\left(\frac{k-\ell-1}{\ell}\right) \right\}$$

in y_1 and

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{V_n}}\left\{T_n^{(\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma)^c}(\tau_{\ell+1}^{-1}\xi)-\sum_{k\in\tau_{\ell+1}\Gamma}k\beta_\ell\left(\frac{k-\ell-1}{\ell}\right)\right\}$$

in y_2, but both these terms behave as $O(1/\sqrt{n})$. Thus, from Proposition 3.1, two terms A_ℓ and B_ℓ both behave as

$$A_\ell,\ B_\ell=\frac{1}{\sqrt{U_nV_n}}\left\{\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\lambda^2}}+o(1)\right\},$$

as $\ell\to\infty$ (or equivalently $n\to\infty$). Since $1-\lambda^2>0$, this shows that $A_\ell/B_\ell\to 1$ and completes the poof of Theorem 2.1 from (4.4).

Remark 4.1. *If we take $\beta(\cdot)$ itself instead of $\beta_\ell(\cdot)$, the terms y_1 and y_2 in the exponential of q_0 behave as $o(\sqrt{n})$ so that q_0 in general converges to* 0 *and the local limit theorem turns out to be useless.*

5 Proof of Corollary 2.2 and relations to Vershik curves

For the proof of Corollary 2.2, it suffices to show the weaker convergence

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty}\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}\left(\left|\langle\tilde{\psi}^\ell,\varphi\rangle-\langle\psi,\varphi\rangle\right|>\delta\right)=0, \tag{5.1}$$

for every $\delta>0$ and $\varphi\in C([-1,1])$, where $\langle\psi,\varphi\rangle=\int_{-1}^1\psi(x)\varphi(x)dx$. In fact, (5.1) implies the stronger convergence result stated in Corollary 2.2 due to the monotonicity of $\tilde{\psi}^\ell$, see Remark 2.5 in [4]. For proving (5.1), it is enough to show that $\langle\tilde{\psi}^\ell,\varphi\rangle$ converges to $\langle\psi,\varphi\rangle$ in L^2-sense. However, recalling (2.11) and (2.8), a simple computation leads to

$$\langle\tilde{\psi}^\ell,\varphi\rangle=\frac{1}{\ell}\sum_{k=-\ell+1}^{\ell}\eta_k\tilde{\varphi}\left(\frac{k}{\ell}\right),$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}(x)=\int_{-1}^x\varphi(y)dy$. Therefore, once we can show that

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty}E_{\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}}\left[\frac{1}{\ell}\sum_{k=-\ell+1}^{\ell}\eta_k\tilde{\varphi}\left(\frac{k}{\ell}\right)\right]=\langle\beta,\tilde{\varphi}\rangle, \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty}E_{\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}}\left[\left\{\frac{1}{\ell}\sum_{k=-\ell+1}^{\ell}\eta_k\tilde{\varphi}\left(\frac{k}{\ell}\right)\right\}^2\right]=\langle\beta,\tilde{\varphi}\rangle^2, \tag{5.3}$$

the L^2-convergence follows by noting that $\langle\beta,\tilde{\varphi}\rangle=\langle\psi,\varphi\rangle$. We only give the proof of (5.3), since (5.2) is similar and easier. To this end, from the estimate

$$\left|\langle\tilde{\psi}^\ell,\varphi\rangle-\int_{-1}^1\eta_{[\ell x]+1}\tilde{\varphi}(x)dx\right|\le 2\sup_{|x_1-x_2|\le\frac{1}{\ell}}|\tilde{\varphi}(x_1)-\tilde{\varphi}(x_2)|,$$

it is enough to prove

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} E_{\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}}\left[\left\{\int_{-1}^{1}\eta_{[\ell x]}\tilde{\varphi}(x)dx\right\}^2\right] = \langle\beta,\tilde{\varphi}\rangle^2, \tag{5.4}$$

where $[\ell x]$ stands for the integer part of ℓx. However, the expectation in (5.4) is expanded as

$$\int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} E_{\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}}[\eta_{[\ell x_1]}\eta_{[\ell x_2]}]\tilde{\varphi}(x_1)\tilde{\varphi}(x_2)dx_1dx_2,$$

and Theorem 2.1 applied for $p = 2$ and $f_1(\eta) = f_2(\eta) = \eta_0$ implies that

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} E_{\nu_{\Lambda_\ell,K,M}}[\eta_{[\ell x_1]}\eta_{[\ell x_2]}] = \beta(x_1)\beta(x_2).$$

Thus, Lebesgue's convergence theorem shows (5.4) and this completes the proof of Corollary 2.2.

We finally compare our result in Corollary 2.2 with those in [1]. In [1], the grand canonical ensembles in a rectangular box for the uniform (Bose) statistics are dealt based on a combinatorial method, while we have discussed the canonical ensembles in a rectangular box for the restricted uniform (Fermi) statistics due to a probabilistic approach.

Theorem 1 of [1] shows, by rotating the plane coordinates by 45 degree, that the limit curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto L(t)$ in the box with the ratio of height/width given by $\bar{\rho}/(1-\bar{\rho}), \bar{\rho} \in (0,1)$ is determined by

$$L(t) \equiv L_{\bar{\rho},\bar{c}}(t) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}}\log\frac{h(t)}{h(0)},$$

where $h(t) = e^{-\bar{c}t} - e^{\bar{c}t} + e^{-\bar{c}(2-2\bar{\rho}-t)} - e^{-\bar{c}(t-2\bar{\rho})}, t \in [0,1]$, and $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{R}$ is a parameter which controls the area. By rotating back to the original coordinates, this curve is transformed to the curve $v = \phi(u)$ in u-v plane given implicitly by

$$u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(t + L(t)) \in [0, (1-\bar{\rho})/\sqrt{2}], \quad v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-t + L(t)) \in [-\sqrt{2}\bar{\rho}, 0]. \tag{5.5}$$

However, as seen in Proposition 4.4 of [4], the curve $v = \phi(u)$ appearing in the uniform statistics can be related to the curve $y = \bar{\psi}(x)$ in x-y plane appearing in the restricted uniform statistics by

$$\bar{\beta}(x) \equiv -\bar{\psi}'(x) = \frac{-\phi'(G_\phi^{-1}(x))}{1-\phi'(G_\phi^{-1}(x))},$$

where $G_\phi(u) = u - \phi(u)$ and G_ϕ^{-1} is its inverse function. But, (5.5) shows that $G_\phi(u) = \sqrt{2}t$ and thus, setting $x = G_\phi(u) \in [0, \sqrt{2}]$, we have that

$$\bar{\beta}(\sqrt{2}t) = \frac{-\phi'(u)}{1-\phi'(u)} = \frac{1-L'(t)}{2},$$

or equivalently

$$\bar{\beta}(x) = \frac{1-L'(x/\sqrt{2})}{2}.$$

A simple computation leads to $L'(t) = h'(t)/(\bar{c}h(t))$ and $L''(t) = \bar{c}(1 - L'(t)^2)$, since $h''(t) = \bar{c}^2 h(t)$. This proves that

$$\bar{\beta}'(x) = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} L''(x/\sqrt{2}) = \frac{\bar{c}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(L'(x/\sqrt{2})^2 - 1 \right) = -\sqrt{2}\bar{c}\,\bar{\beta}(x)(1 - \bar{\beta}(x)),$$

so that we arrive at the ordinary differential equation for $\bar{\psi}$:

$$\bar{\psi}''(x) + \sqrt{2}\bar{c}\,\bar{\psi}'(x)(1 + \bar{\psi}'(x)) = 0, \quad x \in [0, \sqrt{2}]. \tag{5.6}$$

Moreover, noting that $L(0) = 0$ and $L(1) = 1 - 2\bar{\rho}$, the height difference of $\bar{\psi}$ at two boundary points is given by

$$\bar{\psi}(0) - \bar{\psi}(\sqrt{2}) = \int_0^{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\beta}(x)dx = \sqrt{2}\bar{\rho},$$

or, by normalizing $\bar{\psi}(\sqrt{2}) = 0$, we have that $\bar{\psi}(0) = \sqrt{2}\bar{\rho}$.

To compare $\bar{\psi}$ with ψ in Corollary 2.2, note that ψ is defined for $x \in [-1, 1]$. The shift in x does not change the form of the equation. To consider on the interval of same length, we introduce the scaling for $\bar{\psi}$ defined on $[0, \sqrt{2}]$ by

$$\bar{\psi}^\gamma(x) := \frac{1}{\gamma}\bar{\psi}(\gamma x), \quad x \in [0, \sqrt{2}/\gamma],$$

for $\gamma > 0$. Then, if $\bar{\psi}$ satisfies $\bar{\psi}'' + \kappa\bar{\psi}'(1 + \bar{\psi}') = 0$, $\bar{\psi}^\gamma$ satisfies the equation $(\bar{\psi}^\gamma)'' + \kappa\gamma(\bar{\psi}^\gamma)'(1 + (\bar{\psi}^\gamma)') = 0$. Applying this for the equation (5.6) with $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\kappa = \sqrt{2}\bar{c}$, we can derive the equation for $\bar{\psi}^{1/\sqrt{2}}$:

$$(\bar{\psi}^{1/\sqrt{2}})'' + \bar{c}(\bar{\psi}^{1/\sqrt{2}})'(1 + (\bar{\psi}^{1/\sqrt{2}})') = 0, \quad x \in [0, 2],$$

with $\bar{\psi}^{1/\sqrt{2}}(0) = 2\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\psi}^{1/\sqrt{2}}(2) = 0$. This coincides with the ordinary differential equation (2.13) for the Vershik curve with $c = \bar{c}$ and $\rho = \bar{\rho}$. Thus, we can identify the limit curves in a rectangular box for grand canonical ensembles in the uniform statistics and for canonical ensembles in the restricted uniform statistics, namely $\bar{\psi}^{1/\sqrt{2}} = \psi$ (except the shift in x by 1), if the relations $\bar{c} = -b$ and $\bar{\rho} = \rho$ hold.

Acknowledgement The author thanks Yoshiki Otobe for informing him the reference [7].

References

[1] D. Beltoft, C. Boutillier and N. Enriquez, *Random Young diagrams in a rectangular box*, preprint, 2010.

[2] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, *Partial exchangeability and sufficiency*, Statistics: applications and new directions (Calcutta, 1981), 205–236, Indian Statist. Inst., 1984.

[3] P. Diaconis and D.A. Freedman, *Conditional limit theorems for exponential families and finite versions of de Finetti's theorem*, J. Theoret. Probab., **1** (1988), 381–410.

[4] T. Funaki and M. Sasada, *Hydrodynamic limit for an evolutional model of two-dimensional Young diagrams*, Commun. Math. Phys., **299** (2010), 335–363.

[5] T. Funaki, *Hydrodynamic limit for a particle system associated with a surface diffusion model with restricted height differences*, in preparation.

[6] H.O. Georgii, *Canonical Gibbs measures*, Lect. Notes Math., **760**, Springer, 1979.

[7] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, 7th ed., Academic Press, 2007.

[8] H. Hozumi, *Local limit theorem for a sum of random variables with unbounded weights*, Master thesis, Univ. Tokyo, 2011 (in Japanese).

[9] C. Kipnis and C. Landim, *Scaling Limits of Interacting Particle Systems*, Springer, 1999.

[10] T.M. Liggett, *Interacting particle systems*, Springer, 1985.

[11] V.V. Petrov, *Sums of independent random variables*, Springer, 1975.

[12] A. Pimpinelli and J. Villain, *Physics of Crystal Growth*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.

[13] D. Ruelle, *Statistical mechanics: Rigorous results*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., 1969.

[14] A. Vershik, *Statistical mechanics of combinatorial partitions and their limit shapes*, Func. Anal. Appl., **30** (1996), 90–105.